

---

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

---

---

STEVEN DWAYNE FREEMAN,

Petitioner,

*versus*

DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID,

Respondent.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:06-CV-359

**MEMORANDUM ORDER ADOPTING  
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Steven Dwayne Freeman, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The court referred this matter to the Honorable Keith F. Giblin, United States Magistrate Judge, for consideration. The magistrate judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge recommending the petition be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution.

The court has received the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record, pleadings, and all available evidence. No objections were filed to the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation.


**ORDER**

Accordingly, the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct, and the report of the magistrate judge is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered dismissing the petition. If petitioner wishes to have this case reinstated upon the court's active docket, he may do so by submitting a properly certified application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within 30 days of the date set forth below.

In addition, the court is of the opinion petitioner is not entitled to a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); *Elizalde v. Dretke*, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.), *cert. denied*, 531 U.S. 849 (2000).

Here, petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether this petition should be dismissed is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. As a result, a certificate of appealability shall not issue.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 28th day of February, 2007.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Marcia A. Crone".

---

MARCIA A. CRONE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

